



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,242	02/01/2001	Fumio Nagasaka	107926	7319

25944 7590 08/30/2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/701,242

Applicant(s)

NAGASAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,8,11 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,8,11 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 13-20 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 10, 12, are canceled.

#### *Priority*

2. Applicant needs to submit a certified translated copy of the foreign priority document, in order to perfect the claimed foreign priority.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 4, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner et al. 5,796,951 (Hereinafter Hamner) in view of Minasi ("Mastering Windows NT Server 4", fifth edition, 1998, pages 343 – 351, Hereinafter Minasi) and further in view of Person, "Using Windows 95", Special edition, 1995, pages 105-107, Hereinafter Person), as per paper number 13, 02/19/2004.
5. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, in view of Minasi, Person, IDEHARA ("Input-Output Apparatus selecting method for network system", 12/20/2001, US 2001/0552995, Hereinafter IDEHARA) and further in view of Hogan et al. 5,414,809 (Hereinafter Hogan), as per paper number 13, 02/19/2004.

6. Newly added, claims 15-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, Minasi and Person as applied to claims 3, 4, 8 and 11 above and further in view of Idehara.

7. As per claims 15, 16, Hamner, Person and Minasi teach the claimed limitations as rejected under claims 1, 8 and 11. However, Hamner, Person and Minasi do not specifically mention about the details of claims 15 and 16.

Idehara teaches the following:

when an individual description of the desired person is externally input as a specific individual description via said input unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8), gains access to a database that is present on the network or in said device retrieving apparatus (e.g., figures 2 and 33, paragraph 43, col., 3), obtains a device description mapped to the input specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph 132, col., 3) which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), and causes at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151),

when an instruction is given externally via said input unit to select a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person among the individual symbols displayed on the screen (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8), specifies an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the selected specific

Art Unit: 2154

individual symbol as a specific individual description (e.g., figures 16 and 17, paragraph 132, col.,3), gains access to a database that is present on the network or in said device retrieving apparatus (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), obtains a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., figure 21, paragraph 142), which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network (e.g., figures 25 and 26, paragraph 151), and causes at least one of the obtained device description and a device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit (e.g., figures 9 and 25, paragraph 131, col., 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hamner, Person and Minasi with the teachings of Idehara because Idehara's teachings would facilitate location of the information available for each device for an individual to select and have it linked in his device selection. The individual description of the desired person would be externally input as a specific individual description using keyboard and a database would be accessed that is present on the network or local and to obtain a device description mapped to the input specific individual description out of mapping information stored in the database which regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing the plurality of devices present on the network and to cause the obtained device description and a device symbol expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit, as suggested by Idehara.

Art Unit: 2154

8. As per claims 17-20, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claims 15 and 16 above.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 4/28/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Also, applicant's arguments with respect to the newly added claims 14-20 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (1) "The 103(a) rejections, i.e., combination of references, Hamner in view of Minasi and Person, fail to disclose "a device retrieving apparatus comprising a control unit, when an instruction is given externally via an input unit to map a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person, specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description, obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information". The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The combination of references, Hamner, Minasi and Person, clearly teach a device retrieving apparatus comprising a control unit, when an instruction is given externally via an input unit to map a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person (e.g., Hamner's teachings of a control unit to support externally provided user selections/interactions from computer inputs to access and operate a device window 201 and a task window 202 to map one device symbol from the displayed devices to the icon symbol, figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32, Minasi, teachings

Art Unit: 2154

of person symbols and the person information, page 349), specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description (e.g., Hamner's teachings of a control unit to support externally provided user selections/interactions from computer inputs to access and operate a device window 201 and a task window 202 to map one device symbol from the displayed devices to the icon symbol, figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32, Minasi, teachings of person symbols and the person information, page 349), obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information (e.g., Person's use of dragging a symbol and dropping it on another symbol to facilitate an easy and faster mapping of a user symbol the device symbol including execution of the target functionality that also help obtaining a device description mapped to a particular user description for the mapped icon, page 105 – page 107). Hence, Minasi's use of individual person symbol and person information would facilitate identifying individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the information each individual person. The users would be able to easily identify their respective symbols and would help them manage their own personal settings. Person's use of dragging a symbol and dropping it on another symbol would facilitate an easy and faster mapping of a user symbol the device symbol including execution of the target functionality that also help obtaining a device description mapped to a particular user description for the mapped icon. Dragging a device symbol on the user's symbol or the window containing the user's personal settings would be an easier way of mapping a device to the desired user, as suggested by Person. Therefore, combined teachings of Hamner, Minasi and Person meet the claimed limitation.

Applicant argues (2) “The 103(a) rejections, i.e., combination of references, Hamner in view of Minasi and Person, fail to disclose “a computer-readable recording medium in which a specific computer program is recorded, said specific computer program causing the computer to attain the functions of: when an instruction is given externally to the computer to map a desired device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person, obtaining a device description mapped to an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped specific individual symbol out of mapping information”. The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The combination of references, Hamner, Minasi and Person, clearly teach a computer-readable recording medium in which a specific computer program is recorded, said specific computer program causing the computer to attain the functions of: when an instruction is given externally to the computer to map a desired device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person, obtaining a device description mapped to an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped specific individual symbol out of mapping information (e.g., Hamner’s teachings of a control unit to support externally provided user selections/interactions from computer inputs to access and operate a device window 201 and a task window 202 to map one device symbol from the displayed devices to the icon symbol, figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32, Minasi, teachings of person symbols and the person information, page 349, Person’s use of dragging a symbol and dropping it on another symbol to facilitate an easy and faster mapping of a



Art Unit: 2154

user symbol the device symbol including execution of the target functionality that also help obtaining a device description mapped to a particular user description for the mapped icon, page 105 – page 107). Hence, Minasi's use of individual person symbol and person information would facilitate identifying individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the information each individual person. The users would be able to easily identify their respective symbols and would help them manage their own personal settings. Person's use of dragging a symbol and dropping it on another symbol would facilitate an easy and faster mapping of a user symbol the device symbol including execution of the target functionality that also help obtaining a device description mapped to a particular user description for the mapped icon. Dragging a device symbol on the user's symbol or the window containing the user's personal settings would be an easier way of mapping a device to the desired user, as suggested by Person. Therefore, combined teachings of Hamner, Minasi and Person meet the claimed limitation.

Applicant argues (3) "The 103(a) rejections, i.e., combination of references, Hamner in view of Minasi and Person, fail to disclose "a device wherein a control unit causes data symbols representing respective data kept in the device to be displayed in a specific area on the screen of the display unit, which is different from an area in which at least one of the obtained device description, and the corresponding second device symbol is displayed". The examiner disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The combination of references, Hamner, Minasi and Person, clearly teach a device wherein a control unit causes data symbols representing respective data kept in the device to be displayed in a specific area on the screen of the display unit (e.g., Hamner, a device

Art Unit: 2154

window 201 of figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32), which is different from an area in which at least one of the obtained device description, and the corresponding second device symbol is displayed (e.g., Hamner, a task window 202 of figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32, also, Hamner's teachings of a control unit to support externally provided user selections/interactions from computer inputs to access and operate a device window 201 and a task window 202 to map one device symbol from the displayed devices to the icon symbol, figure 2A, figure 2B, col., 4, lines 17 – 32, Minasi, teachings of person symbols and the person information, page 349, Person's use of dragging a symbol and dropping it on another symbol to facilitate an easy and faster mapping of a user symbol the device symbol including execution of the target functionality that also help obtaining a device description mapped to a particular user description for the mapped icon, page 105 – page 107). Hence, Minasi's use of individual person symbol and person information would facilitate identifying individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the information each individual person. The users would be able to easily identify their respective symbols and would help them manage their own personal settings. Person's use of dragging a symbol and dropping it on another symbol would facilitate an easy and faster mapping of a user symbol the device symbol including execution of the target functionality that also help obtaining a device description mapped to a particular user description for the mapped icon. Dragging a device symbol on the user's symbol or the window containing the user's personal settings would be an easier way of mapping a device to the desired user, as suggested by Person. Therefore, combined teachings of Hamner, Minasi and Person meet the claimed limitation.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (703) 605-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached at (703) 305-8498.

The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


Application/Control Number: 09/701,242

Page 11

Art Unit: 2154

Haresh Patel

August 12, 2004



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100